

**FUTURE OF THE MONTANA
COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (MONTCAS)
RESULTS OF A STATEWIDE SURVEY**

Prepared for the Montana Office of Public Instruction by

Stanley Rabinowitz, Ph.D.



November 7, 2008

Future of the Montana Comprehensive Assessment System (MontCAS)

Results of a Statewide Survey

Introduction

While state and local assessments are valued components of accountability systems, the substance and formats of such programs must continuously evolve if they are to truly meet the needs of students, teachers, and schools. At the behest of the Montana Office of Public Instruction (OPI), a survey was designed to get broad input into how MontCAS can better serve its various instructional and accountability functions.

The survey was developed by WestEd with broad input and feedback from a variety of constituencies across the state. WestEd is a nationally recognized independent education R&D organization. While WestEd research, development, and technical assistance covers many programmatic areas, it is especially known in the areas of standards, assessment, and accountability development and evaluation. WestEd was selected as a result of a competitive bid solicitation process. The project director for this survey, Dr. Stanley Rabinowitz, has served as a long time advisor to OPI on assessment issues and is a member of the Montana assessment Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). Thus he and his staff were familiar with the history of MontCAS, its various components, the statewide results over the past several years, and the unique Montanan context in which MontCAS resides.

The survey was developed using a multi-step, comprehensive, inclusive process, involving hundreds of Montana educators, citizens, and national experts. Immediately following the award of the contract to WestEd, Dr. Rabinowitz undertook multiple discussions with OPI assessment staff to determine the purpose, process, content focus, and format of the survey. This preliminary information was validated via multiple focus groups featuring groups of Montana educators and other constituents. The first set occurred on April 28, 2008 as part of the OPI sponsored statewide assessment conference. WestEd developed the focus group protocol and trained several Montana-based facilitators. Using this protocol and training, OPI conducted additional focus groups in the month of May.

Based on the information obtained in the focus groups, WestEd drafted an initial survey. This draft was reviewed by the state's assessment TAC and revised accordingly. Next, the draft was reviewed by the OPI/BPE assessment task force and an OPI internal team, resulting in the final survey. The survey was launched on line during the window of September 15-30 (paper copies were provided on request). Information about the survey and how to access it was disseminated via a statewide newsletter by OPI in late August. Information was also available on the OPI and WestEd websites.

As indicated, the survey was designed for efficient on-line administration. The survey was broken into three sections. Section I solicited demographic information to ensure

that the respondents broadly represented the diversity found across the state. Such information was also collected to help interpret potential differential results across constituencies. (No individual identifying information was collected or connected to survey responses.) Section II focused on current familiarity and satisfaction as well as future directions for the statewide Criterion-Referenced Testing (CRT) program and CRT-Alternate Assessment (CRT-Alt). Section III examined current practices on formative assessment and potential options for a more comprehensive formative assessment system. The survey questions can be found in the Appendix.

Results

In this section we describe the results of the three sections of the survey:

I. Demographics

II. Future Direction for the State Assessment Program

III. Formative Assessment System

For each question, we summarize the results; to see the full response rates for each question, see the Appendix.

I. Demographics

The survey was completed by 1,575 respondents, representing 52 counties across the state of Montana. Thus, a large and diverse group of citizens participated in this opportunity to give direction to the future of the state assessment program. County representation ranged from a low of 1 up to a high of 253. For data analysis purposes, the county responses were converted to the various regions of the state. This allows larger N counts per analysis unit. Table 1 provides that information below.

Table 1

1. 1. Your county (reported in regions)		
Regions	Response Percent	Response Count
South East	4.6%	67
South Central	22.0%	318
4 Rivers	9.8%	142
Central	3.0%	44
Western	24.7%	357
North East	9.5%	137
Hi Line	5.1%	74
North Central	9.3%	135
North West	12.0%	174
answered question		1448
skipped question		127

While the response rate was large and diverse, it cannot be assumed to be fully representative and random. Thus, all results must be interpreted with caution and not presumed to generalize to the views of all Montana educators and citizens.

The largest percentage of responses came from cities (31.9%) and small towns (31.1%) with a sizable number of rural participants (12.8%). More than a third (34.1%) worked in a school system of less than 400 students; 26.0% were from the state's larger school systems (more than 2,500 students). The large majority (85.2%) was from a K-12 education system.

Most respondents were K-12 teachers (71.2%) followed by school administrators (13.5%). The group was relatively experienced—the average number of years in their primary role was 14.3. The group was fairly well spread out among elementary, middle, and high schools (39.4%, 21.2%, and 32.7% respectively). As expected, the majority race of the student population they work with was overwhelmingly white (90.4%) followed by American Indian/Alaskan Native (11.5%). (Participants could mark multiple boxes for this question). A majority of respondents works with Gifted, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities. Only 26.2% work with ELL students, fewer yet with homeless students (23.7%) or migrant students (12.9%).

II. Future Direction for the State Assessment Program

Results in this section are either presented as:

- the average on the five-point scale (e.g., 3.2 out of 5 with 1 denoting Strongly Disagree and 5 Strongly Agree), or
- as the modal response (the most commonly selected point on the five-point scale),

whichever was more illustrative of the responding groups' sentiments.

For each question, we examined the results as a whole and by each demographic sub-category (e.g., city vs. town vs. rural). In some cases, the sample size was too small to reliably report subgroup averages. However, even when larger samples existed, there were few significant differences across the subgroups to note. Thus the results of all questions are summarized at the whole group level.

The above paragraph should not be interpreted to mean that consensus was found across the survey questions. In fact, very few consistent trends emerged. In summary, the large diverse group that responded to the survey had views related to the future of the CRT program that cut across the spectrum of potential next steps.

To no surprise, the large majority of participants was familiar or very familiar with the CRT program (62.1% with an average of 3.74 on the five-point scale). Only 9.3% were not familiar. The majority (61.4%) attributed this familiarity to having administered the CRT and/or used its reports (60.6%). (Respondents could mark more than one category on this and other questions in this section; thus, percentages can and typically do exceed 100%).

As to specific components of the CRT program, the average familiarity ranged from 2.52 for the MARS (formerly iAnalyze) system and 2.53 for the CRT-alternate assessment up to 3.87 for the multiple-choice test items and 3.70 for the short-answer items. It is reassuring to note that the average familiarity for the state's content standards (on which the CRT is based) was 3.75, though almost 30% were not familiar with the standards.

The focus of the survey was on how the CRT might evolve. In this respect, little consensus emerged. The average for each proposed additional content area polled was as follows:

- Art: 2.0 (out of 5)
- Critical Thinking: 3.5
- Music: 2.1
- Social Studies: 3.2
- Indian Education for all: 2.2
- Direct Writing: 3.2

Of greatest surprise, was the lack of support for adding a direct writing component. Only 44.9% agreed or strongly agreed to the proposition. The majority was either opposed or neutral.

No consensus was found as to whether the high school CRT should be changed from its current grade 10 administration point. The survey results were as follows:

- Grade 9: 2.1 (out of 5)
- Grade 11: 3.1
- Grade 12: 2.3
- Split between Grades 10 and 11: 2.6

Nor was there large support to add performance-based assessments to the CRT program; specifically, participants responded as follows:

- Portfolios: 2.4 (out of 5)
- Projects: 2.4
- Laboratories: 2.4

This may reflect the perceived burden of these types of tools as part of the state assessment system rather than a dismissal of the value of such measurements.

Also surprising (given trends in other states and the popularity of commercially-available counterparts in Montana and nationally), less than a majority of respondents (38.1%) favored or strongly favored a computer-based (on-line) administration of the CRT program.

There was a noted preference for the CRT to be administered later in the school year (3.73) and for results to be reported back to schools earlier in the school year than the current schedule allows (3.96). As a note, it will be difficult to achieve both preferences simultaneously without shifting to a computer-administered assessment system that can allow more efficient transfer of test data and immediate scoring of the multiple-choice sections of the test.

As to be expected, familiarity with the CRT-Alternate Assessment was significantly less than the CRT itself. This is not surprising since the CRT-Alt is targeted at just one percent of the state's student population—those with the most significant cognitive disabilities. Overall familiarity averaged just 2.16 (out of 5) with a modal response of Not Familiar (49,2%). Since, almost a third of respondents omitted this question (477),

clearly awareness of this aspect of the program seems primarily limited to those directly involved.

No clear trends for change emerged from the survey respondents in the CRT-Alt section. Overall satisfaction averaged 2.50 with little consensus on how the program might be modified or improved.

As to the overall CRT program, overall satisfaction might best be described as moderate with a modal response of 3 (40.5 %) and an average satisfaction rate of 2.40. As with the CRT-Alt, little consensus on how the program might be modified or improved emerged. (See the **Next Steps** section for a possible explanation for part of the dissatisfaction with the CRT program.)

As indicated above, little difference existed across the demographic subgroups responding to this survey. This conclusion can best be demonstrated by the question on overall CRT satisfaction. Table 2 reports results by size/type of Montana community. As can be seen, despite large differences in response size (N), the mean ratings were very similar across the various sub-categories.

Table 2

2. Size/type of Montana community	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
No response	2.38	8	.916
City	2.40	409	.962
Large town	2.05	120	.924
Medium town	2.29	164	.938
Rural	2.59	179	1.004
Small town	2.47	419	.936
Urban fringe	2.61	33	.933
Total	2.41	1332	.961

A large number of respondents (318) included additional comments at the end of their survey. Review of these comments suggests they are consistent with the information gleaned from the responses to the specific questions included on the survey.

III. Formative Assessment System

As with Section II, results in this section are either presented as:

- the average on the five-point scale (e.g., 3.2 out of 5 with 1 denoting Strongly Disagree and 5 Strongly Agree), or
- as the modal response (the most commonly selected point on the five-point scale),

whichever was more illustrative of the responding groups' sentiments.

The large majority of respondents (70.6%) reported that their school and/or district have formative assessment practices or expectations in place, though nearly a third (31.3%) are not able to indicate how long these have been in effect. Many schools/districts have had such practices in place for several years (nearly 40% either 4-6 years or greater than 6 years). About another third had these practices in place less than four years. Given the large number of omits on this question (710), the actual longevity of formative assessment use in Montana can be presumed to be somewhat lower than these figures suggest.

While these practices have been in place for a range of years, what these practices are vary greatly across the state. This reflects the lack of consensus nationally on which practices can be properly classified as formative and which are most beneficial to students. The survey found that the two most common practices across the country were reflected in Montana. The use of Interim/Benchmark assessments and Instructionally Embedded assessments were reported at identical rates: 3.1 out of 5. No other practice approached these high levels of use. As with the previous question, a large number of respondents (706) omitted this question, suggesting that overall use is less than might be presumed from the data reported.

Large percentages of respondents reported that teachers (89.6%) and administrators (88.0%) were involved in local formative assessment practices. The next highest category was omits (775 respondents).

Somewhat more than half of the participants (56.4%) responded to the question about teacher professional development practices across the state. These practices ranged from how to develop, implement, and use and communicate the results from formative assessments. Overall, none was found to occur on a regular basis (averages range from 2.38 to 2.81 out of 5).

Greater support was found for the need to identify additional resources to improve current formative assessment practice. All options averaged above 3.0, with the highest being for increased professional development opportunities (3.84). Other desired supports included tech support (both hardware and software), development of item banks, and dissemination of best practices.

Less approval existed for a formal OPI/state role in supporting formative assessment practices in the state. In summary, there was significantly higher support for dissemination and item banking (all averaging over 3.0) practices than goal setting, reporting, and monitoring (all averaging under 3.0).

Eighty-nine (89) respondents included additional comments at the end of their survey. Review of these comments suggests they are consistent with the information gleaned from the responses to the specific questions included on the survey.

Conclusions

The following conclusions can be drawn from the survey's sample and responses.

Demographics. Response to the survey was large and demographically diverse, representing the geographic breadth of Montana and a range of school types and roles in education. However, because of the voluntary, on-line administration process, the sample is certainly not random and cannot be assumed to be fully representative of the state's population. Thus, results must be generalized with caution.

CRT Program. The respondents reported themselves to be highly familiar with the various components and feature of the CRT program, less so with the CRT-Alt. Moderate satisfaction was found with the existing program. Little support was found to expand the program into additional content areas. No consensus emerged on possible next steps as the CRT program evolves.

Formative Assessment. The respondents reported significant activity around the state over the past several years. They indicated support for more professional development opportunities and for dissemination of best practices and item banks. Little desire was expressed for a formal state role in monitoring local formative assessment practices.

Next Steps

WestEd recommends that the following activities occur as follow-up to the survey and its results and conclusions.

- Given the range of opinions expressed by survey respondents and the lack of consensus about next steps, we encourage OPI to plan a series of open discussions and hearings on the meaning of these findings across the state.
- OPI should delve more deeply into the range of reasons for specific satisfactions and dissatisfactions with the current program as it plans the next phase of MontCAS development and implementation. As to the overall modest degree of satisfaction found in the survey, information obtained from the April and May focus groups suggests that part of the dissatisfaction with the CRT program is its

linkage to NCLB AYP accountability decisions. OPI should attempt to separate out concerns with the CRT program itself and dissatisfaction with its role in accountability.

- OPI should develop and implement policies designed to increase public satisfaction with the CRT program from its current moderate level, consistent with the technical requirements of a statewide assessment system used for accountability purposes and resources available (fiscal and staffing) to support any proposed modifications.
- As discussions continue around reauthorization of NCLB, OPI should use the results of this survey and subsequent meeting and discussions to weigh in on options consistent with the needs and interests of the full range of Montana schools and students.
- OPI should focus on providing strategies and resources to support local formative assessment activities, consistent with the results of this study. The emphasis should be on increased professional development activities and resources, rather than on an expanded state monitoring role.

Appendix: Survey Questions and Results

Page: I. Demographic Information

1. 1. Your county
<i>Note: Although the county name is being requested, results will be summarized by region.</i>

NOTE: See Table 1, page 4 of the report narrative for regional summary.

2. 2. Size/type of Montana community			
		Response Percent	Response Count
City		31.9%	497
Large town		9.4%	147
Medium town		12.5%	194
Small town		31.1%	484
Urban fringe		2.4%	38
Rural		12.8%	199
		answered question	1558
		skipped question	17

3. 3. Size of education system			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Less than 400 students		34.1%	529
Between 400 and 800 students		14.8%	230
Between 800 and 1200 students		9.2%	143
Between 1200 and 2500 students		16.0%	248
More than 2500 students		26.0%	404
		answered question	1553
		skipped question	22

4. 4. Type of education system			
		Response Percent	Response Count
K-12		85.2%	1326
Independent Elementary		9.2%	143
Independent High School		4.7%	73
Post Secondary		0.8%	13
Other		2.3%	36
		answered question	1557

4. 4. Type of education system		
	skipped question	18

5. 5. Your primary role			
		Response Percent	Response Count
K-12 teacher		71.2%	1109
School administrator		13.5%	210
School board member		0.1%	1
System test coordinator		3.2%	50
Other professional staff		11.7%	182
Other staff		2.4%	37
Higher education		0.3%	4
		answered question	1557
		skipped question	18

6. 6. Number of years in your primary role				
		Response Average	Response Total	Response Count
# Years		14.26	22091	1549
		answered question		1548
		skipped question		27

7. 7. Your primary school level			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Elementary		39.4%	612
Middle		21.2%	329
High School		32.7%	508
K-12		10.8%	168
Post Secondary		0.9%	14
Other		0.9%	14
		answered question	1553
		skipped question	22

8. 8. Majority race of the student population you work with			
		Response Percent	Response Count
American Indian/Alaskan Native		11.5%	178
Asian		0.3%	4
Black or African American		0.4%	6
Hispanic or Latino		0.7%	11
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander		0.5%	7
White, Non-Hispanic		90.4%	1397
Other (please specify)			19
		answered question	1546
		skipped question	29

9. 9. Special student populations you work with (check all that apply)			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Gifted		53.6%	771
Migrant		12.9%	185
Homeless		23.7%	341
Economically disadvantaged		84.3%	1212
Limited English proficient		26.2%	377
Students with disabilities		77.5%	1115
		answered question	1438
		skipped question	137

Page: II. Future Direction for the Statewide Assessment Program

10. 1. How familiar are you with the current Criterion-Referenced Testing (CRT) Program?							
	Not Familiar 1	2	3	4	Very Familiar 5	Rating Average	Response Count
CRT Program	4.5% (55)	9.3% (114)	24.1% (295)	31.7% (387)	30.4% (371)	3.74	1222
	answered question						1220
	skipped question						355

11.			
1a. Describe the nature of your experience with the test (check all that apply):			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Test development		8.6%	118
Standard setting		22.6%	309
Test administration		61.4%	840
System/school test coordinator		14.8%	202
Use reports and data		60.6%	830
Use released items		46.9%	642
None of the above		12.9%	176
	answered question		1369
	skipped question		206

12.							
2. Indicate your familiarity with the following components of the Assessment Program:							
	Not Familiar 1	2	3	4	Very Familiar 5	Rating Average	Response Count
State content standards	4.7% (64)	8.1% (111)	21.7% (296)	38.8% (529)	26.7% (365)	3.75	1365
Item type: multiple choice	5.5% (74)	6.6% (88)	18.6% (249)	34.2% (458)	35.2% (472)	3.87	1341
Item type: constructive response	6.2% (84)	9.1% (124)	22.5% (305)	33.1% (449)	29.1% (395)	3.70	1357
Item type: short answer	6.3% (84)	8.6% (115)	23.1% (309)	33.0% (441)	29.0% (387)	3.70	1336
Assessment reports	9.4% (126)	11.9% (160)	26.2% (352)	33.5% (450)	18.9% (254)	3.41	1342
MARS (formerly iAnalyze)	33.7% (449)	18.1% (241)	20.3% (270)	17.8% (237)	10.1% (134)	2.52	1331
Released items	18.2% (245)	11.9% (160)	20.3% (273)	25.8% (347)	23.7% (319)	3.25	1344
CRT Alternate Assessment	29.8% (397)	21.9% (292)	22.8% (304)	16.5% (219)	8.9% (119)	2.53	1331
Accommodation policy	13.5% (183)	16.1% (218)	23.9% (323)	25.5% (345)	21.0% (284)	3.24	1353
Test security	10.4% (140)	9.3% (124)	14.5% (194)	25.7% (345)	40.1% (537)	3.76	1340
	answered question						1371
	skipped question						204

13.

Please indicate your degree of agreement with each of the statements on the following scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree.....5 = Strongly Agree

2a. Additional content areas should be added to the Assessment program

(Note: Any additional areas would not be used for AYP accountability purposes)

	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5	Rating Average	Response Count
Art	49.4% (652)	19.0% (251)	19.4% (256)	7.3% (96)	4.9% (65)	1.99	1320
Critical thinking/problem solving	13.4% (175)	5.4% (71)	25.2% (330)	30.8% (403)	25.2% (329)	3.49	1308
Indian Education for All	39.6% (525)	21.8% (289)	24.6% (326)	7.4% (98)	6.6% (88)	2.20	1326
Music	46.4% (607)	20.0% (261)	20.2% (264)	7.4% (97)	6.0% (78)	2.07	1307
Social studies	17.2% (224)	8.2% (107)	27.1% (353)	28.5% (372)	19.0% (247)	3.24	1303
None	37.7% (211)	8.4% (47)	20.0% (112)	6.8% (38)	27.1% (152)	2.77	560
Other (please specify)							70
answered question							1359
skipped question							216

14.

2b. A direct writing assessment should be added to the Assessment program

	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5	Rating Average	Response Count
Writing assessment	15.8% (209)	10.2% (135)	29.1% (386)	24.4% (324)	20.5% (272)	3.24	1326
answered question							1324
skipped question							251

15.							
2c. Should the grade tested in high school be changed from grade 10? If so, it should be changed to which of the following grades?							
	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5	Rating Average	Response Count
Grade 9	56.0% (538)	11.1% (107)	15.9% (153)	5.9% (57)	11.0% (106)	2.05	961
Grade 11	26.9% (279)	5.7% (59)	21.5% (223)	22.3% (231)	23.7% (246)	3.10	1038
Grade 12	50.1% (472)	9.6% (90)	15.8% (149)	9.0% (85)	15.5% (146)	2.30	942
Split between grades 10/11	35.2% (315)	8.4% (75)	28.8% (258)	15.8% (141)	11.8% (106)	2.61	895
answered question							1192
skipped question							383

16.							
2d. Performance based assessments should be added to the Assessment program							
	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5	Rating Average	Response Count
Portfolios	39.8% (527)	14.1% (187)	20.7% (274)	13.3% (176)	12.0% (159)	2.44	1323
Projects	41.2% (542)	13.4% (176)	20.9% (274)	13.3% (175)	11.2% (147)	2.40	1314
Laboratories	39.9% (522)	15.9% (208)	21.2% (277)	12.6% (165)	10.5% (137)	2.38	1309
answered question							1331
skipped question							244

17.							
2e. The Assessment program should be computer (on-line) administered							
	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5	Rating Average	Response Count
On-line testing	20.8% (279)	12.7% (170)	28.4% (380)	19.4% (260)	18.7% (251)	3.03	1340
answered question							1338
skipped question							237

18.

2f. The Assessment should be administered at a different point in the school year

	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5	Rating Average	Response Count
Earlier	48.3% (546)	10.2% (115)	20.4% (230)	9.2% (104)	11.9% (135)	2.26	1130
Later	13.2% (142)	5.5% (59)	19.1% (206)	19.8% (213)	42.4% (456)	3.73	1076
	answered question						1312
	skipped question						263

19.

2g. CRT results should be reported earlier than the current schedule allows

	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5	Rating Average	Response Count
Earlier results	4.5% (59)	4.8% (64)	24.4% (322)	23.2% (306)	43.1% (569)	3.96	1320
	answered question						1318
	skipped question						257

20. 3. How satisfied are you with the current CRT Program?

	Not Satisfied 1	2	3	4	Very Satisfied 5	Rating Average	Response Count
Overall satisfaction	22.2% (296)	26.5% (354)	40.5% (540)	10.2% (136)	0.6% (8)	2.40	1334
	answered question						1332
	skipped question						243

21.

4. Indicate your familiarity with the CRT-Alternate Assessment (CRT-Alt)

If not familiar, go to question 7

	Not Familiar 1	2	3	4	Very Familiar 5	Rating Average	Response Count
CRT-Alt	49.2% (541)	14.3% (157)	16.2% (178)	11.4% (125)	8.9% (98)	2.16	1099
	answered question						1098
	skipped question						477

22.

4a. Describe the nature of your involvement with the CRT-Alt (check all that apply)

	Response Percent	Response Count
Test development	4.4%	31
Standard setting	9.4%	67
Test administration	35.5%	252
System/school test coordinator	19.9%	141
Use reports and data	36.1%	256
Use sample items	19.6%	139
None of the above	36.1%	256
	answered question	710
	skipped question	865

23.

4b. Indicate your familiarity with the following components of the CRT-Alt program

	Not Familiar 1	2	3	4	Very Familiar 5	Rating Average	Response Count
CRT-Alternate assessment	32.6% (236)	15.2% (110)	22.4% (162)	17.0% (123)	12.7% (92)	2.62	723
Expanded benchmark	41.6% (298)	19.7% (141)	19.3% (138)	12.0% (86)	7.4% (53)	2.24	716
Accommodation policy	25.4% (183)	11.5% (83)	20.3% (146)	22.1% (159)	20.7% (149)	3.01	720
Sample items	33.3% (238)	13.8% (99)	20.0% (143)	19.0% (136)	13.8% (99)	2.66	715
Test security	27.1% (195)	9.2% (66)	11.1% (80)	18.5% (133)	34.1% (245)	3.23	719
	answered question						729
	skipped question						846

24.

Please indicate your degree of agreement with each statement on the following scale:

1 = Strongly Disagree..... 5 = Strongly Agree

5. The CRT-Alt should be administered at a different point in the school year

	Strongly Disagree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Agree 5	Rating Average	Response Count
Earlier	43.6% (254)	10.7% (62)	29.2% (170)	6.5% (38)	10.0% (58)	2.29	582
Later	16.5% (94)	5.6% (32)	29.3% (167)	16.1% (92)	32.5% (185)	3.42	570
	answered question						670
	skipped question						905

25. 6. How satisfied are you with the current CRT-Alt program

	Not Satisfied 1	2	3	4	Very Satisfied 5	Rating Average	Response Count
CRT-Alt Satisfaction	23.2% (153)	16.2% (107)	49.5% (326)	9.4% (62)	1.7% (11)	2.50	659
	answered question						657
	skipped question						918

26. 7. Please add any additional thoughts you may have to improve the current CRT and/or CRT-Alternate Program.	
	Response Count
	318
answered question	318
skipped question	1257

Page: III. Formative Assessment System

27. 1. Does your school district have formative assessment practices and/or expectations in place?			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		70.6%	841
No (if no, go to question 5)		29.4%	351
		answered question	1192
		skipped question	383

28.			
2. If yes, how long have those practices and/or expectations been in effect?			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Less than 2 years		7.4%	64
2 - 4 years		22.9%	198
4 - 6 years		14.7%	127
More than 6 years		23.7%	205
Don't know		31.3%	271
		answered question	865
		skipped question	710

29.			
3. Which of the following groups have been involved in those practices and/or expectations (Check all that apply):			
		Response Percent	Response Count
Teachers		89.6%	717
Administrators		88.0%	704
Learning teams		41.6%	333
University faculty		4.4%	35
Parents		20.1%	161
Consultants		21.1%	169
Other (please specify)			37
		answered question	800
		skipped question	775

30.

4. Indicate the degree to which the following formative assessment activities are taking place in your school district

1 = Never.....5 = Regularly

	Don't Know	Never 1	2	3	4	Regularly 5	Rating Average	Response Count
Interim/ Benchmark Assessments	22.3% (192)	2.3% (20)	5.1% (44)	19.4% (167)	20.4% (176)	30.4% (262)	3.05	861
Instructionally embedded assessments	23.1% (198)	1.2% (10)	5.1% (44)	17.2% (148)	23.0% (197)	30.4% (261)	3.07	858
Formative item/task development activities	27.6% (233)	2.0% (17)	7.7% (65)	23.1% (195)	20.5% (173)	19.1% (161)	2.64	844
Grade level, department, or learning teams on the use of formative assessment	20.7% (176)	5.1% (43)	9.5% (81)	21.8% (185)	21.2% (180)	21.7% (184)	2.83	849
Collaboration with other schools in the district	33.0% (278)	14.2% (120)	9.6% (81)	17.3% (146)	12.9% (109)	12.9% (109)	2.02	843
Collaboration with other districts/ consortia	40.6% (343)	17.5% (148)	10.9% (92)	15.5% (131)	8.6% (73)	6.8% (57)	1.54	844
	answered question							869
	skipped question							706

31.

4a. Teacher professional development

	Don't Know	Never 1	2	3	4	Regularly 5	Rating Average	Response Count
How to write clear learning targets	15.3% (135)	9.6% (85)	14.5% (128)	29.8% (264)	19.9% (176)	11.0% (97)	2.62	885
How to match those targets with the appropriate type of assessment	15.3% (134)	10.0% (88)	15.8% (139)	30.4% (267)	19.5% (171)	9.0% (79)	2.56	878
How to communicate about state performance first to student and then to parents, etc.	16.8% (148)	14.4% (127)	15.9% (140)	27.8% (245)	17.5% (154)	7.7% (68)	2.38	882
How to interpret formative assessment results	12.5% (110)	7.6% (67)	15.6% (137)	26.2% (230)	26.6% (233)	11.4% (100)	2.81	877
How to tailor instruction to students based on formative assessment results	12.5% (109)	8.8% (77)	16.1% (141)	28.3% (248)	23.0% (201)	11.3% (99)	2.75	875
	answered question							888
	skipped question							687

32.

5. Indicate the degree to which the following resources would benefit the development and implementation of formative assessments in your education system:

1 = Not Important.....5 = Very Important

	Don't Know	Not Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5	Rating Average	Response Count
Tech support: hardware	19.0% (224)	4.6% (54)	6.5% (77)	18.8% (221)	24.3% (286)	26.8% (315)	3.05	1177
Tech support: software	18.7% (220)	3.7% (43)	5.2% (61)	18.2% (214)	26.1% (307)	28.2% (332)	3.14	1177
Item banks	22.7% (265)	2.1% (24)	4.2% (49)	19.7% (230)	26.0% (304)	25.4% (297)	3.01	1169
Information on best practices	12.4% (146)	1.8% (21)	3.6% (42)	15.0% (177)	29.7% (351)	37.6% (444)	3.61	1181
Training/ professional development	10.1% (119)	1.4% (17)	2.5% (30)	12.6% (149)	26.5% (312)	46.8% (551)	3.84	1178
	answered question							1185
	skipped question							390

33.

6. Indicate the degree to which the following OPI/State roles would benefit the development and implementation of formative assessment in your school district:

	Don't Know	Not Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5	Rating Average	Response Count
Assistance in setting goals and expectations for local formative assessment programs	17.1% (199)	7.0% (81)	8.6% (100)	28.7% (334)	23.2% (270)	15.3% (178)	2.80	1162
Development and dissemination of professional development activities	13.8% (161)	3.0% (35)	5.5% (64)	23.1% (269)	29.9% (348)	24.7% (288)	3.26	1165
Develop recommendations on teacher pre-service training in formative assessment	14.4% (167)	3.5% (41)	6.2% (72)	24.5% (284)	27.8% (323)	23.5% (273)	3.18	1160
Support regional cooperatives/consortia	16.8% (195)	5.5% (64)	7.3% (85)	25.2% (293)	24.4% (284)	20.9% (243)	2.98	1164
OPI serve as a clearinghouse for best practices	15.5% (180)	5.2% (60)	6.3% (73)	21.8% (254)	27.1% (315)	24.2% (281)	3.12	1163
Review and disseminate information on formative assessment software and other tools	14.5% (168)	2.9% (33)	7.6% (88)	24.1% (279)	27.9% (322)	23.0% (266)	3.17	1156
Develop a formative	16.0% (186)	3.0% (35)	5.5% (64)	20.9% (243)	29.0% (338)	25.6% (298)	3.21	1164

33.

6. Indicate the degree to which the following OPI/State roles would benefit the development and implementation of formative assessment in your school district:

	Don't Know	Not Important 1	2	3	4	Very Important 5	Rating Average	Response Count
assessment item bank								
Report formative assessment implementation status to state	19.9% (228)	7.8% (90)	7.9% (91)	25.5% (293)	22.3% (256)	16.6% (190)	2.72	1148
Develop a local formative assessment grant program	18.7% (215)	4.1% (47)	7.2% (83)	22.5% (258)	24.9% (286)	22.5% (258)	2.98	1147
	answered question							1173
	skipped question							402

34.

7. Please add any additional thoughts you may have to improve formative assessment policy and practice in Montana.

	Response Count
	89
answered question	89
skipped question	1486